

### REMARKS

The Official Action dated July 1, 2005, has been carefully considered. Accordingly, the changes presented herein, taken with the following remarks, are believed sufficient to place the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner noted that claims 8, 10, and 11 contained allowable subject matter, but objected to the claims as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and stated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The recognition of this allowable subject matter is gratefully appreciated. By present amendment, claims 8 and 10 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 8 and 10 now are in allowable form. With this amendment, claim 11 is directly dependent upon claim 10, and thus is also in allowable form. Accordingly, the objection is traversed, and allowance of claims 8, 10 and 11 is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to an informality in claim 10. The objection is traversed. By present amendment, the informality has been corrected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.


In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wieser (U.S. 6,450,745). The rejection is traversed. While Wieser does not anticipate the present invention because the expansion sleeve (ref. 7) of Wieser causes the dowel to expand at the opening or trailing end (ref. 4) and not at the apex end (ref. 3), in contrast to the present invention where the opposite occurs (the apex end expands while the opposite end does not), claim 1 is cancelled by present amendment. Claims 3-7 and 9 have been amended to be dependent upon rewritten independent claim 8. As noted above, claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form and thus is now in allowable

form. As claim 8 is now allowable, claims 3-7 and 9, which are now directly or indirectly dependent on claim 8, are also allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wieser in view of Brendle (U.S. Pat. No. 4,086,799). The rejection is traversed. By present amendment, claim 2 now directly depends on newly independent claim 8, which has been rewritten and is now in allowable form. Claim 2 no longer depends on claim 1, which has been cancelled. As claim 8 is now allowable, claim 2 is also allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the rejections of claims 2-7 and 9 have been traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a), and in light of the amendments to claims 8 and 10, places the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance of claims 2-11 are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Edward Ramage, Reg. No. 50,810  
Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell &  
Berkowitz, PC  
211 Commerce Street, Suite 1000  
Nashville, TN 37201  
615-726-5771